arXiv:1404.1976v2 [math.RT] 30 Aug 2014

Maximal rigid objects without loops in connected 2-CY categories are cluster-tilting objects

Jinde Xu Baiyu Ouyang *

College of Mathematics and Computer Science,

Key Laboratory of High Performance Computing and

Stochastic Information Processing (Ministry of Education of China),

Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, P. R. China

Abstract

In this paper, we study the conjecture II.1.9 of [BIRS], which said that any maximal rigid object without loops or 2-cycles in its quiver is a cluster-tilting object in a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category $\mathcal{C}$. We obtain some conditions equivalent to the conjecture, and using them we proved the conjecture.

Key words: cluster-tilting objects; maximal rigid objects; 2-CY categories.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16G20, 16G70, 18E30

1 Introduction

The theory of cluster algebras, initiated by Fomin-Zelevinsky in [FZ1], and further developed in a series of papers, including [FZ2, BFZ, FZ3], has turned out to have interesting connections with many parts of algebra and other branches of mathematics. The cluster categories associated with finite dimensional hereditary algebras introduced in [BMRRT] and the module categories modΛ for Λ the preprojective algebra of a Dynkin quiver[GLS] have been developed for the categorification of cluster algebras. This development has both inspired new directions of investigations on the categorical side, as well as interesting feedback on the theory of cluster algebras. We

*Corresponding author.

Email Address: hnu_xujinde@126.com(J.D.Xu), oy@hunnu.edu.cn(B.Y.Ouyang).

Supported by the NSF of China (No. 11371131) and in part by Construct Program of the Key Discipline in Hunan Province.

refer the reader to the nice papers [BM, BMR1, BMR2, BMRRT, GLS, Ke1, Rei, Rin] for the further results.

Both the cluster categories and the stable categories $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}\Lambda$ of preprojective algebras are triangulated 2-Calabi-Yau categories (2-CY for short). They both have what are called cluster-tilting objects, which are important since they are the analogs of clusters. Hence the theory of cluster tilting objects in 2-CY categories has been studied in a lot of papers, for example [BIRS, BIKR, IY, ZZ] etc. Cluster-tilting objects (subcategories) in 2-CY categories have many nice properties. For example, the endomorphism algebras are Gorenstein algebras of dimension at most 1 [KR]; cluster-tilting objects have the same number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands[DK]. Cluster-tilting objects are maximal rigid objects, however the converse is not true in general. For examples of 2-CY categories in which maximal rigid objects are not cluster tilting please refer to [BIKR, BMV]. It is natural to ask under what conditions maximal rigid objects will be cluster-tilting. In [BIRS], Buan, Iyama, Reiten and Scott proved that for an exact stably 2-CY category $\mathcal{C}$ if it admits a cluster-tilting subcategory, then every functorially finite maximal rigid subcategory is cluster-tilting in Theorem II.1.8, which was generalized to arbitrary 2-CY categories by Zhou and Zhu (Theorem 2.6 [ZZ]). In addition, they gave a conjecture in [BIRS]

Conjecture 1 (Conjecture II.1.9 [BIRS])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category. Then any maximal rigid object without loops or 2-cycles in its quiver is a cluster-tilting object.*

The aim of this paper is to prove this conjecture.

Cluster-tilting subcategories in Calabi-Yau categories, and in general n-rigid S_n-subcategories in triangulated categories with a Serre functor , was systematic studied by Iyama and Yoshino in [IY]. The notion of subfactor categories was induced, moreover Iyama and Yoshino get a result that there is a one-one correspondence between cluster-tilting subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ containing $\mathcal{D}$ and cluster-tilting subcategories of the subfactor category $\mathcal{U}$ (Theorem4.9 [IY]). Inspired by this theorem, we reduce the conjecture to the following: if T is an indecomposable maximal rigid object without loops, then T is a cluster-tilting object. From this point of view, we obtain some conditions equivalent to the conjecture, which we then use to prove the conjecture.

Theorem 3.6'. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category. Then any maximal rigid object without loops in its quiver is a cluster-tilting object.*

The paper is organized as follows.

In section 2, we collect some useful notions and results which will be used in the proof of the conjecture, especially the notion of the subfactor subcategories. In section 3, we give the proof of main results.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, k denotes an algebraically closed field and $\mathcal{C}$ denotes a k-linear triangulated category whose shift functor is denoted by [1]. We assume, unless otherwise stated, that $\mathcal{C}$ is Hom-finite and Krull-Schmidt, i.e. any object of $\mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of objects whose endomorphism rings are local. We denote by $\mathsf{ind}\mathcal{C}$ the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects in $\mathcal{C}$, and by $\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ the set of morphisms from X to Y in $\mathcal{C}$. We denote by $\mathrm{rad}_{\mathcal{C}}$ the *Jacobson radical* of $\mathcal{C}$, namely, $\mathrm{rad}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{rad}_{\mathcal{C}}(X,X)$ coincides with the Jacobson radical of the endomorphism ring $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$. For basic references on representation theory of algebras and triangulated categories, we refer to [ASS, Hap].

For a subcategory $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, we always mean that $\mathcal{D}$ is a full subcategory which is closed under isomorphisms, direct sums and direct summands. $\mathcal{D}^{\perp}$ (resp. ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{D}$) denotes the subcategory consisting of $X \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{C}(D,X)=0$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}(X,D)=0$) for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$. For any object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ we denote by $\mathsf{add}T$ the smallest additive subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ containing T.

A morphism $f : X \to Y$ is called *right minimal* if every $h \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}X$ such that $fh = f$ is an automorphism. We call f *a right almost split* morphism if $f \in \mathrm{rad}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and

$$\mathcal{C}(-,X) \xrightarrow{f_*} rad_{\mathcal{C}}(-,Y) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact as functors on $\mathcal{C}$. A morphism f is called *right minimal almost split* if it both right minimal and right almost split. Dually, a *left minimal almost split* morphism is defined. For a subcategory $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, we call f *a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation* of $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ if $X \in \mathcal{D}$ and

$$\mathcal{C}(-,X) \xrightarrow{f_*} \mathcal{C}(-,Y) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact as functor on $\mathcal{D}$. Similarly, we call a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation *minimal* if it is right minimal. We call $\mathcal{D}$ *a contravariantly finite subcategory* of $\mathcal{C}$ if any $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ has a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation. Dually, *a (minimal) left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation* and *a covariantly finite subcategory* are defined. A contravariantly and covariantly finite subcategory is called *functorially finite*. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{add}T$ is functorially finite for any object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ using Hom-finiteness and the fact that the number of indecomposable summands of T is finite.

For two subcategories $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$ denotes the collection consisting of all objects E occurring in triangles $X \to E \to Y \to X[1]$, where $X \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. We call $\mathcal{X}$ extension closed if $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}$. By the octahedral axiom, we have $(\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}) * \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} * (\mathcal{Y} * \mathcal{Z})$.

Definition 2.1. For $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put $\mathrm{Ext}^n(X,Y) = \mathcal{C}(X, Y[n])$. A triangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ is called 2-Calabi-Yau, 2-CY for short , if there are bifunctorial

isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(X,Y) = D\mathrm{Ext}^1(Y,X)$$

for $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, where $D = \mathrm{Hom}_k(-,k)$ is the duality of k-spaces.

A Hom-finite triangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ is 2-CY if and only if it has almost split triangles with the AR-translation τ and $\tau : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a functor isomorphic to the shift functor [1] (see [RV]). An exact category is called a stably 2-CY category if it is Frobenius, that is, it has enough projectives and injectives, which coincide, and the stable category is a 2-CY triangulated category. If a triangulated category is triangulated equivalent to the stable category of a stably 2-CY exact category, then we call it an algebraic triangulated 2-CY category[BIRS]. For more examples and information on 2-CY category please refer to [BIRS, Ke2, Ke3].

Definition 2.2 (Definition 2.1 [ZZ])**.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a subcategory of a triangulated 2-CY category $\mathcal{C}$.

- $\mathcal{T}$ is called *rigid* if $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}) = 0$.
- $\mathcal{T}$ is called *maximal rigid* if $\mathcal{T}$ is rigid and is maximal with respect to this property, i.e. if $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathsf{add}M, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathsf{add}M) = 0$, then $M \in \mathcal{T}$.
- $\mathcal{T}$ is called *cluster-tilting* if $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}[-1]^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{T}[1]$.

An object T is called *rigid*, *maximal rigid* or *cluster-tilting* if $\mathsf{add}T$ is a rigid, maximal rigid, or cluster tilting subcategory respectively.

Remark 2.3.

1. Higher analogous concepts of n-rigid, maximal n-rigid and n-cluster-tilting subcategories were defined in [IY]. As such, rigid, maximal rigid and cluster tilting subcategories are often known as 2-rigid, maximal 2-rigid and 2-cluster-tilting subcategories, respectively.

2. Any triangulated 2-CY category $\mathcal{C}$ admits rigid subcategories (0 is viewed as a trivial rigid object), and also admits maximal rigid subcategories if $\mathcal{C}$ is skeletally small. But there are triangulated 2-CY categories which contain no cluster-tilting subcategories [BIKR, BMV].

3. Cluster-tilting subcategories are functorially finite maximal rigid subcategories. But the converse is not true in general [BIKR, BMV]. It was observed by Buan-Marsh-Vatne [BMV] that the cluster tubes contain maximal rigid objects, but none of them are cluster-tilting objects.

4. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a functorially finite maximal rigid subcategory of a triangulated 2-CY category $\mathcal{C}$. Then every rigid object belongs to $\mathcal{T} * \mathcal{T}[1]$. $\mathcal{T}$ is cluster-tilting if and only if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{T} * \mathcal{T}[1]$ (see [ZZ]).

In order to prove our main results, let us review some useful notions and results (for more details please refer to [IY, ZZ]).

Definition 2.4 (Definition 2.5 [IY]). Fix a subcategory $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[1]) = 0$. For a subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, put

$$\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{D} * \mathcal{X}[1]) \cap^{\perp} \mathcal{D}[1].$$

Then $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$ consists of all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that there exists a triangle $X \stackrel{f}{\to} D_X \to C \to X[1]$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and a left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation f.
Dually, for a subcategory $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, put

$$\mu(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{D}[1]) \cap \mathcal{D}[-1]^{\perp}.$$

Then $\mu(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D})$ consists of all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that there exists a triangle $C \to D_Y \stackrel{g}{\to} Y \to C[1]$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation g.
We call a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ of subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ a $\mathcal{D}$-*mutation pair* if

$$\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Y} \subset \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{X} \subset \mu(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D}).$$

It is not difficult to see that: for subcategories $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ containing $\mathcal{D}$, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ forms a $\mathcal{D}$-mutation pair if and only if for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $Y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ there are two triangles:

$$X \xrightarrow{f} D \xrightarrow{g} Y \longrightarrow X[1]$$

$$X_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} D_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} Y_1 \longrightarrow X_1[1]$$

where $D, D_1 \in \mathcal{D}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}, X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, f and f_1 are left $\mathcal{D}$-approximations; g and g_1 are right $\mathcal{D}$-approximations. Hence, for a $\mathcal{D}$-mutation pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, Iyama and Yoshino construct a functor $\mathbb{G} : \mathcal{X}/[\mathcal{D}] \to \mathcal{Y}/[\mathcal{D}]$ as follows: For any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, fix a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} D_X \xrightarrow{\beta_X} \mathbb{G}X \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} X[1]$$

where $D_X \in \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{G}X \in \mathcal{Y}$, and α_X is a left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation, β_X is a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation, and define $\mathbb{G}X$ by this. For any morphism $f \in \mathcal{C}(X, X')$, $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$, there exist morphisms g and h which make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} & D_X & \xrightarrow{\beta_X} & \mathbb{G}X & \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} & X[1] \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f[1]} \\ X' & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{X'}} & D_{X'} & \xrightarrow{\beta_{X'}} & \mathbb{G}X' & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{X'}} & X'[1] \end{array}$$

Now put $\mathbb{G}\bar{f} := \bar{h}$.

Proposition 2.5 (Proposition 2.6 [IY]). *In the situation above, the following assertions hold.*

(1) *The functor* $\mathbb{G} : \mathcal{X}/[\mathcal{D}] \to \mathcal{Y}/[\mathcal{D}]$ *is an equivalence of categories.*

(2) $\mathcal{Y} = \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$ *and* $\mathcal{X} = \mu(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D})$ *hold.*

Next, we will introduce the notion of subfactor triangulated categories which was also defined by Iyama and Yoshino in [IY]. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a triangulated category and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ be subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$. Assume $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ satisfy the following two conditions:

(Z1) $\mathcal{Z}$ is extension closed, i.e. $\mathcal{Z} * \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}$.

(Z2) $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ forms a $\mathcal{D}$-mutation pair.

Definition 2.6 (Definition 4.1 [IY]). Under above setting, put the subfactor category

$$\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}]$$

where $[\mathcal{D}]$ is the ideal of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of morphisms which factor through objects in $\mathcal{D}$.

Denote by $\langle 1 \rangle$ the equivalence $\mathbb{G} : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ constructed in Proposition 2.5. Thus for $\forall X \in \mathcal{Z}$, there exists a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} D_X \xrightarrow{\beta_X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} X[1]$$

where α_X is a left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation of X and $X\langle 1 \rangle \in \mathcal{Z}$. Note that $X\langle 1 \rangle$ is unique up to summands in $\mathcal{D}$.

Let $X \xrightarrow{a} Y \xrightarrow{b} Z \xrightarrow{c} X[1]$ be a triangle in $\mathcal{C}$ with $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Since $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Z}[-1], \mathcal{D}) = 0$, which makes the composition $Z[-1] \to X \to D_X$ is zero, then there is a commutative diagram of triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{b} & Z & \xrightarrow{c} & X[1] \\ \| & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle d} & & \| \\ X & \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} & D_X & \xrightarrow{\beta_X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} & X[1] \end{array}$$

with α_X a left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation and β_X a right $\mathcal{D}$-approximation. Define *the triangles* in $\mathcal{U}$ to be the diagrams in $\mathcal{U}$ which are isomorphic to a diagram

$$X \xrightarrow{\overline{a}} Y \xrightarrow{\overline{b}} Z \xrightarrow{\overline{d}} X\langle 1 \rangle$$

in $\mathcal{U}$, where $\overline{a}, \overline{b}, \overline{d}$ are the residue classes of morphisms a, b, d.

Theorem 2.7 (Theorem 4.2 [IY]). *The category* $\mathcal{U}$ *forms a triangulated category with respect to the auto-equivalence* $\langle 1 \rangle$ *and triangles defined in Definition 2.6.*

In the following, we collect some useful properties of the subfactor category $\mathcal{U}$ which were proved in [IY].

Lemma 2.8 (Proposition 4.4(1) [IY]). *In the situation above, if $\mathcal{T}$ is a rigid subcategory of $\mathcal{Z}$, then so is $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ as a subcategory of $\mathcal{U}$.*

Theorem 2.9 (Theorem 4.7 of [IY] in the case $n = 2$). *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a triangulated 2-CY category, $\mathcal{D}$ a functorially finite rigid subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. Set $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{D}[-1]^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{D}[1]$, then the subfactor category $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}]$ forms a triangulated 2-CY category too.*

3 Main Proof

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a Hom-finite Krull-Schmidt additive category, $T = T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus ... \oplus T_n$ a basic object of $\mathcal{C}$, where T_i are non-isomorphic indecomposable summands of T. For any object $M \in \mathcal{C}$, if there is a non-zero minimal left $\mathsf{add}T$-approximation $f : M \to T'$ of M, assume $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f'' \end{pmatrix} : M \longrightarrow T_1 \oplus T''$, then f_1 cannot factor through $\mathsf{add}(T/T_1)$.*

Proof. If f_1 factors through some non-zero object $N \in \mathsf{add}(T/T_1)$, i.e. $f_1 = gh$, then we have a commutative diagram of morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & N \oplus T'' & \\ {\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix} h \\ f'' \end{pmatrix}} \nearrow & & \searrow {\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} \\ M & \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f'' \end{pmatrix}]{} & T_1 \oplus T'' \end{array}$$

where $N, T'', T_1 \in \mathsf{add}T$.

We claim $\begin{pmatrix} h \\ f'' \end{pmatrix} : M \longrightarrow N \oplus T''$ is a left $\mathsf{add}T$-approximation of M. Indeed, For any $X \in \mathsf{add}T$, $\forall \varphi : M \to X$, there exists a morphism $\psi : T_1 \oplus T'' \to X$ such that $\varphi = \psi f$ because f is a left $\mathsf{add}T$-approximation. Noting that $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f'' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h \\ f'' \end{pmatrix}$, hence $\varphi = \psi \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h \\ f'' \end{pmatrix}$. That means the sequence

$$(N \oplus T'', X) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} h \\ f'' \end{pmatrix}^*} (M, X) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

As we know the minimal left approximation is a direct summand of any left approximation by Proposition5.1.2 of [EJ], i.e. $T_1 \oplus T''$ is a direct summand of $N \oplus T''$, T_1 must be a direct summand of N by the *unique decomposition theorem* . But in our case, that is impossible, because T_1 is not contained in N as a direct summand. $\square$

We call a subcategory $\mathcal{T}'$ an almost complete maximal rigid subcategory if there is an indecomposable object X which is not isomorphic to any object in $\mathcal{T}'$ such that $\mathcal{T} = \mathsf{add}(\mathcal{T}' \cup \{X\})$ is a functorially finite maximal rigid subcategory in $\mathcal{C}$. Such X is called a *complement* of an almost complete maximal rigid subcategory $\mathcal{T}'$. Noting that the radical of $\mathrm{End}_C X$ is nilpotent for any complement X and $\mathcal{T}$ has right and left almost split morphisms by functorially finiteness of $\mathcal{T}$, it is easy to see that any almost complete maximal rigid subcategory is functorially finite (cf. Proposition 3.13 of [AS]). As before, an object T' is called almost complete maximal rigid if $\mathsf{add}T'$ is an almost complete maximal rigid subcategory.

Lemma 3.2. [Corollary3.3 [ZZ]] *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a triangulated 2-CY category, $\mathcal{T}'$ an almost complete maximal rigid subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. Then there are exactly two complements of $\mathcal{T}'$, say X and Y. Denote by $\mathcal{T} = \mathsf{add}(\mathcal{T}' \cup \{X\})$, $\mathcal{T}^* = \mathsf{add}(\mathcal{T}' \cup \{Y\})$. Then (T, T^*), (T^*, T) are T'-mutation pairs.*

Let $T = T_1^{m_1} \oplus T_2^{m_2} \oplus ... \oplus T_n^{m_n}$ be an object in $\mathcal{C}$, where the T_i are pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable objects and $m_i \geq 1$. Let $S_i = S_{T_i}$ be the simple $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(T)$-module corresponding to T_i, and $P_i = \mathcal{C}(T_i, T)$ be the indecomposable projective $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(T)$-module with top S_i. It is well known that the following numbers are equal for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ [ASS, GLS]:

- The number of arrows $i \to j$ in the quiver of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}} T$;
- $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_{End(T)}(S_i, S_j)$;
- The dimension of the space of irreducible maps $T_i \to T_j$ in the category $\mathsf{add}T$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $X \ncong Y$ be the two complements of a basic almost complete maximal rigid object T'. Then the following are equivalent:*

- *The quiver of $End_{\mathcal{C}}(T' \oplus X)$ has no loops at X;*
- *Every non-isomorphism $\varphi : X \to X$ factors through $\mathsf{add}T'$;*
- *$dim\, Ext^1_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X) = 1$.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 6.1 in [GLS] works also in this setting. For the convenience of the reader we briefly give the proof. The equivalence of the first two statements is easy to show. By Lemma 3.2, there is a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{f} T_1 \xrightarrow{g} Y \longrightarrow X[1]$$

where f is a left approximation and $T_1 \in \mathsf{add}T'$. Applying $\mathcal{C}(-, X)$ functor yields an exact sequence

$$\mathcal{C}(T_1, X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}(f,X)} \mathcal{C}(X, X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(Y[-1], X) \longrightarrow 0$$

Since f is an $\mathsf{add}T'$-approximation, every non-isomorphism $\varphi : X \to X$ factors through $\mathsf{add}T'$ if and only if it factors through f. This is equivalent to the cokernel $Ext^1_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X) = 1$ of $\mathcal{C}(f, X)$ being 1-dimensional. Here we use that k is an algebraically closed field, which implies that $\mathcal{C}(X, X)/\mathrm{rad}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, X) \cong k$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a triangulated 2-CY category, T a basic maximal rigid object without loops in its quiver. Assume $T = T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus ... \oplus T_n$ where T_i are non-isomorphic indecomposable summands of T and $T' = T/T_i$ is an almost complete maximal rigid object for any $1 \leq i \leq n$.*
Put $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{add}T' \subset \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{D}[-1]^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{D}[1]$, and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}]$. Then

$$T\langle 1\rangle \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow T \qquad \text{and} \qquad T \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow T\langle 1\rangle \longrightarrow T\langle 1\rangle$$

are AR-triangles in $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.9, $\mathcal{U}$ is a 2-CY category with shift $\langle 1\rangle$, and 0 is an almost complete maximal rigid object. By Lemma 3.2, there are exactly two complements of 0, that is to say there are only two maximal rigid objects (up to isomorphism) in $\mathcal{U}$, which consist of exactly one direct summand. Because $\mathcal{U}(T\langle 1\rangle, T\langle 2\rangle) = \mathcal{U}(T, T\langle 1\rangle) = 0$ by Proposition 2.8, T and $T\langle 1\rangle$ are maximal rigid objects of $\mathcal{U}$, similarly $T\langle i\rangle$ is a maximal rigid object for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. But there are only two maximal rigid objects in $\mathcal{U}$ and $T\langle i\rangle$ and $T\langle i+1\rangle$ are distinct maximal rigid objects by $\mathcal{U}(T\langle i\rangle, T\langle i+1\rangle) = 0$, hence we get that

$$T\langle -1\rangle \cong T\langle 1\rangle \cong ... \cong T\langle odd\rangle \qquad \text{and} \qquad T\langle 0\rangle \cong T\langle 2\rangle \cong ... \cong T\langle even\rangle$$

Because the quiver of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}T$ has no loops, clearly the quiver of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{U}}T$ has no loops too. By Lemma 3.3, $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{U}}(T, T\langle 1\rangle) = \dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{U}}(T\langle 1\rangle, T) = 1$, Noting that $\langle 1\rangle = \tau_{\mathcal{U}}$ because $\mathcal{U}$ is 2-CY, then $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \tau T) = \dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{U}}(\tau T, T) = 1$. That means the non-split triangles

$$T\langle 1\rangle \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow T \qquad \text{and} \qquad T \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow T\langle 1\rangle \longrightarrow T\langle 1\rangle$$

are AR-triangles in $\mathcal{U}$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category, T a basic maximal rigid object whose quiver has no loops, $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = T[-1]^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}T[1]$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *T is a cluster-tilting object;*

(2) *${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp} = 0$;*

(3) *${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} = 0$ or $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp} = 0$.*

Proof. Obviously (3) ⇒ (2).

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): By the definition of cluster-tilting, $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathsf{add}T$, hence

$$^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} = ^{\perp} T \cap \mathsf{add}T = 0.$$

Similarly $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp} = 0$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): In order to prove T is cluster tilting, it suffices to prove $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \mathsf{add}T$. Let X be a non-zero indecomposable object of $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. Then $\mathcal{C}(X,T) \neq 0$ or $\mathcal{C}(T,X) \neq 0$ by condition (2).

If $\mathcal{C}(X,T) \neq 0$, then we have a non-zero minimal left $\mathsf{add}T$-approximation $f : X \to T'$ of X. Because $f \neq 0$, by decomposing T' we can find an indecomposable summand $T_i \neq 0$ and $f_i \neq 0$ such that

$$f = \begin{pmatrix} f_i \\ f'' \end{pmatrix} : \ X \longrightarrow T_i \oplus T'' \ .$$

We can assume $i = 1$, then $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f'' \end{pmatrix} : \ X \longrightarrow T_1 \oplus T''$, and $f_1 : X \to T_1$ does not factor through $\mathsf{add}(T/T_1)$ by Lemma 3.1.

Now put $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{add}(T/T_1)$, $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{D}[-1]^{\perp} = ^{\perp} \mathcal{D}[1]$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}]$. Noting $f_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$ because $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, then the residue of f_1 in $\mathcal{U}$, denoted by $\bar{f}_1$, is not zero by the definition of $\mathcal{U}$ (f_1 does not factor through $\mathsf{add}(T/T_1)$), and it follows that $X \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{U}$.
Then we get that $X \in \mathsf{add}T$ in $\mathcal{C}$ as follows. By Lemma 3.4, the triangle

$$T_1\langle 1\rangle \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow T_1 \longrightarrow T_1$$

is the AR-triangle ending at T_1, noting $T_1 \cong T$ in $\mathcal{U}$. If $\bar{f}_1$ were not a retraction, then it would factor though $0 \to T_1$ (right minimal almost split), i.e. there is a g such that $\bar{f}_1 = 0 \cdot g = 0$, in contradiction to $\bar{f}_1 \neq 0$. Therefore, $\bar{f}_1$ is a retraction, but X is indecomposable, then $X \cong T_1 \cong T$ in the subfactor category $\mathcal{U}$. That means $X \oplus D_1 \cong T_1 \oplus D_2$ in $\mathcal{Z}$, $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, by the *unique decomposition theorem* and $T_1 \notin \mathcal{D}$, T_1 must be a direct summand of X. Again because X is indecomposable in $\mathcal{Z}$, we get $X \cong T_1$ in $\mathcal{Z}$, hence in $\mathcal{C}$, that means $X \in \mathsf{add}T$.

If $\mathcal{C}(T,X) \neq 0$, by the same argument using the dual of Lemma 3.1, we also have $X \in \mathsf{add}T$. Hence, $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \mathsf{add}T$, i.e. T is a cluster-tilting object. We have completed the proof. □

Now, we can prove the conjecture. Recall that a triangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be connected if the underlying graph $\overline{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}$ of the AR-quiver $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a connected graph, where *the underlying graph* $\overline{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is obtained from $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ by forgetting the orientation of the arrows. For the definition of AR-quiver of a triangulated category please refer to [Hap].

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category. Then any maximal rigid object T without loops or 2-cycles in its quiver is a cluster-tilting object.*

Proof. Let T be a basic maximal rigid object whose quiver has no loops. Using the notations from Theorem 3.5, it suffices to show that ${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp} = 0$.

If ${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp} \neq 0$, let $0 \neq M \in^{\perp} T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$ with M indecomposable. If the space of irreducible maps $\mathrm{Irr}_{\mathcal{C}}(N, M) \neq 0$ for some indecomposable object N, i.e. there exists an irreducible map from N to M. We claim that N is also in ${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$. Indeed, taking the AR-triangle ending at M

$$\tau M \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow \tau M[1] \ ,$$

and applying functors $\mathcal{C}(-, T[1])$ and $\mathcal{C}(T, -)$, we obtain the following exact sequences

$$0 = \mathcal{C}(M, T[1]) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(E, T[1]) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\tau M, T[1]) = \mathcal{C}(M[1], T[1]) = 0 \qquad \text{(a)}$$

$$0 = \mathcal{C}(T, M[1]) = \mathcal{C}(T, \tau M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(T, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(T, M) = 0 \qquad \text{(b)}$$

Then we get $E \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ from (a) and $E \in T^{\perp}$ from (b).

To prove our claim, it suffices to show $E \in^{\perp} T$. If $\mathcal{C}(E, T) \neq 0$, there at least exists a non-zero indecomposable direct summand X of E such that $\mathcal{C}(X, T) \neq 0$. Noting that $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ since $E \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$, then using the same arguments in the proof of "(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" in Theorem 3.5, we get $X \in \mathsf{add}T$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Since $X \in \mathsf{add}T$ is an indecomposable direct summand of E, there exist irreducible morphisms between X and M. Then $\mathcal{C}(T, M) \neq 0$, in contradiction to $M \in T^{\perp}$. Hence $E \in^{\perp} T$ and thus, $N \in^{\perp} T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$.

If $\mathrm{Irr}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, N') \neq 0$, dually we can prove $N' \in^{\perp} T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$. (Applying functors $\mathcal{C}(T[-1], -)$ and $\mathcal{C}(-, T)$ to the AR-triangle $M \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow M[-1] \longrightarrow M[1]$.)

We have shown that if N (resp. N') is a direct predecessor (resp. successor) of $M \in^{\perp} T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$, then N (resp. N') also belongs to ${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$. That means the connected component which contains M is contained in ${}^{\perp}T \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T^{\perp}$, which is of course contained in ${}^{\perp}T$. So T and M cannot be in the same connected component, in contradiction to the connectness of $\mathcal{C}$. □

Noting that in the proof of the theorem, we do not use the condition that the quiver of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}T$ has no 2-cycles. Hence the Theorem 3.6 can be restated as follows:

Theorem 3.6'. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category. Then any maximal rigid object without loops in its quiver is a cluster-tilting object.*

The following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.6' by combining Theorem 2.6 of [ZZ]

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected Hom-finite triangulated 2-CY category. If $\mathcal{C}$ has a maximal rigid object whose quiver has no loops, then every maximal rigid object is cluster-tilting.*

Example 3.8. *Let R be a one-dimension simple hypersurface singularity. Then the category $CM(R)$ of maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules is a Frobenius category, and so that the stable category $\underline{CM}(R)$ is a triangulated 2-CY category [BIKR]. In the case D_n with n odd, the AR-quiver of $\underline{CM}(R)$ is the following ([BIKR] or [Y])*



where the dotted line between two indecomposable modules means that they are connected via τ. Proposition 2.5 of [BIKR] proved that the indecomposable modules A and B are maximal rigid objects in $\underline{CM}(R)$ but none of them is cluster-tilting. And the computation of the support of $\underline{Hom}(A,-)$ is the following



where $B = \tau A$ and $l = (n-3)/2$. Hence the quiver of $\underline{End}(A)$ has a loop, the case of B is the same.

But the condition that the quiver has no loops is not necessary for a cluster-tilting object, for example:

Example 3.9. *Let R be a one-dimension simple hypersurface singularity in the case A_n with n odd. the AR-quiver of $\underline{CM}(R)$ is the following ([BIKR] or [Y])*



It was proved in Proposition 2.4 of [BIKR] that N_+ and N_- are cluster-tilting objects in $\underline{CM}(R)$, and the computation of the support of $\underline{Hom}(N_-, -)$ is the following



where $l = (n-1)/2$. This shows that the quiver of $End(N_-)$ has a loop even though N_- is cluster-tilting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Professor Bin Zhu for his helpful suggestions in this work. The authors also would like to thank the referee for the very kind and helpful comments and advice in shaping the paper into its present form.

References

[AS] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalø, Preprojective modules over artin algebras, J. Algebra. 66(1) (1980) 61-122.

[ASS] I. Assem, D. Simson, A.Skowroński, Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras, Vol.1. Techniques of representation theory, London Mathematical Society Student Textx, 65. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[BFZ] A. Berenstein, S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras III: upper bounds and double Bruhat cells, Duke Math. J. 126 (1) (2005) 1-52.

[BIKR] I. Burban, O. Iyama, B. Keller, I. Reiten, Cluster tilting for one-dimensional hypersurface singularities, Adv. Math. 217(2008) 2443-2484.

[BIRS] A.B. Buan, O. Iyama, I. Reiten, J. Scott, Cluster structures for 2-Calabi-Yau categories and unipotent groups, Compo. Math. 145 (4) (2009) 1035-1079.

[BM] A.B. Buan, R. Marsh, Cluster-tilting theory, Trends in representation theory of algebras and related topics, 1-30, Contemp. Math., 406, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

[BMR1] A.B. Buan, R. Marsh, I. Reiten, Cluster-tilted algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 359 (1) (2007) 323-332.

[BMR2] A.B. Buan, R. Marsh, I. Reiten, Cluster mutation via quiver representations, Comm. Math. Helv. 83(1) (2008) 143-178.

[BMRRT] A.B. Buan, R. Marsh, M. Reineke, I. Reiten, G.Todorov, Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics, Advances in Math. 204 (2006) 572-618.

[BMV] A.B. Buan, R. Marsh, D. Vatne, Cluster structure from 2-Calabi-Yau categories with loops, Math. Z. 265 (2010) 951-970.

[DK] R. Dehy, B. Keller, On the Combinatorics of Rigid Objects in 2-Calabi-Yau Categories, International Mathematics Research Notices, Vol. 2008, Article ID run029, 17 pages.

[EJ] E.E. Enochs, O.M.G. Jenda, Relative Homological Algebra, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2000.

[FZ1] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, Cluster Algebras I: foundations, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 15(2)(2002) 497-529.

[FZ2] S. Fomin, A.Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras II: finite type classification, Invent. Math. 154(1)(2003) 63-121.

[FZ3] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras IV: coefficients, Compositio Mathematica 143(1)(2007)112-164.

[GLS] C. Geiß, B. Leclerc, J. Schröer, Rigid modules over preprojective algebras, Invent. math. 165 (3) (2006) 589-632.

[IY] O. Iyama, Y. Yoshino, Mutations in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules, Invent. Math. 172 (2008) 117-168.

[Hap] D. Happel, Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 119, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

[KR] B. Keller, I. Reiten, Cluster-tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi-Yau, Adv. Math. 211 (2007) 123-151.

[Ke1] B. Keller, Cluster algebras, quiver representations and triangulated categories, In Triangulated categories,London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 375, Cambridge, Pages 76-160, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambrdge, 2010.

[Ke2] B. Keller, Triangulated orbit categories, Documenta Math. 10 (2005) 551-581.

[Ke3] B. Keller, Triangulated Calabi-Yau categories, Trends in Representation Theory of Algebras (Zurich) (A. Skowronski, ed.), European Mathematical Society, 2008, pp. 467-489.

[Rei] I. Reiten, Cluster categories, Proceedings of ICM, Hyderabad, India, 2010.

[RV] I. Reiten, M. Van den Bergh, Noetherian hereditary abelian categories satisfying Serre duality, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 15 (2) (2002) 295-366.

[Rin] C. M. Ringel, Some remarks concerning tilting modules and tilted algebras, Origin. Relevance. Future, An appendix to the Handbook of tilting theory, edited by Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Dieter Happel and Henning Krause, Cambridge University Press (2007), LMS Lecture Notes Series 332.

[Y] Y. Yoshino, Cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 146 (1990).

[ZZ] Y. Zhou, B. Zhu, Maximal rigid subcategories in 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated categories, J. Algebra. 348 (2011) 49-60.